HIGHER EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Staff Summary

February 21, 2006

In attendance: Denny Heck, Libby Street, Beth Thew, Steve Mullin, John Warner, Roy Flores, Bernal Baca, Jim Bricker, Michael Miles, Betti Sheldon, Dave Spangler, Jane Sherman, Diana Mamerto Holz, Susannah Malarkey, Steve Mullin, Ray Lawton, Tim Stensager, Robert Segura, Diana Mamerto-Holz

Staff: Dana Richardson, Governor's Policy Office; Marc Webster, Office of Financial Management; Sarah Reyneveld, Washington Learns

The meeting began with a call to order and introductions from the new Chair Denny Heck and members of the Higher Education Advisory Committee.

The group then reviewed the Higher Education Advisory Committees decision-making process. After some discussion, the group unanimously readopted the decision-making process outlined in Washington Learns Operating Guidelines and Procedures "voting procedures."

Next, Bill Chance and Bill Zumeta presented NORED's progress report entitled "The Context and Character of Higher Education in Washington State." The report provided context for Washington's higher education funding system and allocation of costs among state funds, tuition and financial aid. It also reviewed alternative funding systems, budget development methodologies and allocation models. The report examined where Washington ranks in the context of Baccalaureate production, High Demand Programs and Workforce training. Finally, the report examined how Washington's higher education system compares globally.

Chair Denny Heck introduced a list of questions that members of the Higher Education Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee directed to the consultant NORED at the January 12th meeting. Sarah Reyneveld presented and reviewed the questions. The committee was then tasked with breaking up into their respective Work Groups—funding, transitions and enrollment--to discuss the questions and come up with three issues/problems that the group felt were most important to the work of the committee. Bernal Baca reported back to the group on behalf of the Transitions Group; Dave Spangler reported back to the group on behalf of the Funding Group; and Suzanna Malarkey reported back to the group on behalf of the Enrollment group. For further information on the respective reports please see the Funding, Transitions and Enrollment work group notes.

Bill Chance and Dick Lutz presented the updated P-20 state survey and options paper entitled "Progress Report: Survey of State P-20 programs." Bill Chance reviewed eight options based on steps that other states had taken to consolidate their P-20 systems. The group engaged in a lively discussion of the options presented.

Finally, the Chair led a meeting debrief.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15. The committee then spent the remainder of the afternoon in their respective groups funding, transitions and enrollments.

Funding Group

In attendance: Jim Bricker, Roy Flores, Dave Spangler, John Warner,

Staff: Sarah Reyneveld

Technical Advisors: Mary Alice Grobins (SBCTC); Vi Boyer (Indy Colleges); Harlan Patterson (UW)

Based on the set of questions presented in the Higher Education Advisory Committee general meeting the respective groups were asked to identify three questions or problems that they felt were most critical to examine.

After a discussion the group decided on the following three issues/problems:

1) Need to determine the number of enrollments
- Number of current enrollments required and projections for next 15 years
- Demographic and high demand information. Determine enrollments for high demand areas.
- Determine public/private demand for enrollments

2) Need Post-Secondary System to support “smooth” or seamless transitions.

- Achieve integrated P-20 system

3) Need to determine how we distribute resources to support Higher Education needs

- 2 year/ 4 year/ research
- Method of delivery must be considered. Specifically, the utilization of distance learning, dual enrollment options and the private sector.
- Distribution Model must be considered. Specifically the share of public sector, the family (tuition) and private philanthropy.

Also, the group also spoke to the importance of a "Governance/Decision Making" process in the area of enrollment, capacity and transitions.

Dave Spangler reported these three issues to the entire group.

The group reconvened after the lunch break for the scheduled Funding Group Meeting. The group heard a presentation from Wolf Opitz, Deputy Director of the Office of Financial Management, on the Washington State budget and current Higher Education funding system. Mr. Opitz reminded the group that in the context of the Washington state budget, Higher Education funding, as well as student participation, is discretionary. Thus, funding for Higher Education should be examined in the context of the state's obligation to other priorities including Heath Care and Pensions. Mr. Optiz also spoke about enrollment capacity in terms of the operating budget and capital budget. Mr. Opitz reminded the group that while Higher Education funding is usually viewed in terms of the operating budget, it is also highly determined by the capital budget. The presentation also provided a brief overview of the history of tuition policy in Washington State.

Mr. Opitz's presentation prompted a group discussion on Washington State Tuition (see Higher Education Coordinating Board's overview of Tuition History in Washington State located on page 21 <http://www.hecb.wa.gov/docs/2005-06%20WA%20State%20Tuition%20and%20Fees.pdf>) and different types of tuition policy. Sarah Reyneveld led a discussion based on a chart which illustrated costs to the state/student if current tuition was set at a percentage of the cost of instruction based on the 1) Council of Postsecondary Education and 2) Carnegie Commission models reviewed in NORED's progress report "The Context and Character of Higher Education in Washington State." The group discussed the option of tuition rates set as a percentage of educational costs and requested information on two other types of tuition policy options-- "sliding scale" and "high tuition/high aid"--for the March 23rd Meeting.

The funding group then met jointly with the Enrollment Group. The larger group discussed the need to define success and desired outcomes by sector.

The groups also discussed how to distribute funding to meet Washington State's needs. The dual-enrollment and alternate methods of delivery might be a source of efficiency, which both groups agreed is an important goal. Along those lines, the groups discussed the need for a distribution or governance model that integrates the capital and operating impacts of enrollment and programmatic changes. Even assuming increased demand (due to improvements in K-12, for example) and increased financial aid, what support structures need to be in place in order to retain first generation college students? Additional questions/suggestions included: what's the 'tipping point' at which an entirely new program is needed? When do you have to create something new instead of adding on to an existing program? Should we set a floor for postsecondary education? Instead of focusing on BAs and advanced engineering and science degrees, would we be more effective by targeting getting more people through one year of community/technical college? Finally, the group recognized the need to acknowledge the contributions of the independent colleges especially in the high demand areas of nursing and engineering (five engineering programs in the ICW institutions). We should use this capacity as long as we can ensure that low-income students pay the same out of pocket cost that they would have had they attended a public college.

Enrollment Group

The Enrollment Group's first task before lunch was to agree to three issues or problems that the group feels are the most important.

Many people agreed that the paramount task was getting the correct number of enrollments to keep Washington competitive along with the right programmatic mix; we need engineers, not humanities majors.

The group discussed programmatic guidance or targets: would we get science students or English majors? The institutions are responding to incentives that prioritize the latter. The group also discussed a scale tuition/subsidy model that might give some sort of bonus for students in high-demand programs. That preserves some flexibility to use the same framework for any majors/fields that become 'high demand.'

A question was also raised regarding how long term the group should focus? If the group is trying to design an optimal system for between one and five, perhaps even ten years, then the recommendations would necessarily be more prescriptive - bonuses given for math/science courses, special education, nursing, etc. But if the group is trying to focus 20 years out, there's simply no way to know which majors and occupations will be in high demand. That produces a very different set of recommendations: it grants the institutions much more autonomy and relies on the institutions' flexibility to respond to emergent state needs.

Many discussed whether the state should divide the program mix more clearly in order to avoid duplication of effort. There are good reasons for that, but they are, in part, designed to resist change and flexibility. Flexibility in funding might get us the degrees we want.

The group decided on the following three issues/problems:

1: We need to incent both institutions and students to respond to and meet the needs of the state.

2: There should be a spot in the postsecondary system for all qualified applicants.

3: A responsive system that acknowledges that the 21st century requires life-long learning education diverse populations, and that is responsive to demographic needs.

Susannah presented these issues to the entire group.

After lunch, the group heard a presentation on OFM Forecasting's calculation of the participation rate. Irv Lefberg discussed the statutory requirements and the basic framework of the forecast they do for the Governor and the Legislature: the population by single year of age is determined for a number of ranges (17-22, 17-29, etc.) and the current proportion of that age range who are enrolled in college is applied to the new population figures. This approach is easy to understand, and policy makers want to know if they're 'falling behind' in the college-going rates of the past, but it's also not perfect. It tends to 'lock in' policy choices made previously; that is, there's nothing magical about the current participation rate, and it's not clear what we achieve by enshrining it in forecasts. That said, trying to apply policy goals to forecasts like this inevitably leads to political arguments and consensus can't be achieved: why should we use policy X in determining the forecast and not policy Y?

The group had a number of questions and 'assignments' for Irv and the Forecasting group. Specifically, the group requested:

1: Enrollment projections given changes/improvement in the high school graduation rate

2: Identify the factors that affect demand

3: Compare Washington's participation rates with that of other states

4: Compare Washington's Baccalaureate production with that of other states

5: Start with current participation rate and adjust it for a number of policy changes - increasing high demand degrees, lower/higher cost, better preparation in K-12, etc.

Finally, the group met with the Funding Group and discussed how the two subgroups would work together. For notes, please see Funding Group.

Transitions Group

In Attendance:

Work Group Members: Tim Stensager, Libby Street, Robert Segura, Bernal Baca, Diana Mamerto-Holz

Staff: Dana Richardson

Technical Advisors: Cindy Morana, Council of Presidents; Kyra Kester, OSPI; Sally Zeiger-Hansen, SBCTC, Bryan Wilson, WFB

Guests: Sid Sidorowicz, City of Seattle; Seanna Ruvkun, Workforce Development Council, King County; Emily Leggio, University of Washington; Madeleine Thompson, Workforce Board; Loretta Seppanen, SBCTC

The entire meeting focused on a review of a set of draft position statements that derived from previous meetings and phone conversations and the previous night's conversation with the K-12 Advisory Committee Structures, Systems and Policy Work Group. The following is a reworked draft that contains position statements and, for some, the rationale behind each position statement. These will form the basis of discussion at a phone conference call on March 7.

Members of the Transitions Work Group recognize that a number of barriers exist to easy transition from the K-12 system to the higher education system and recommend an integrated, holistic approach based on best practices to minimize these barriers. Specifically, the work group members is considering the following and, in doing so, recognizes that each of these positions may raise issues related to curriculum, staffing capacity, and professional development in both the K-12 and higher education systems. Members support efforts to target resources for these specific purposes and propose an approach that phases in new programs and policies.

<u>Guidance and Advising Systems</u>

Position Statement 1: K-12 Guidance and Advising Systems

- *The state shall encourage each school district to implement a guidance and advising system that begins in elementary school, that is intensive, student centered, and curriculum driven, and that complies with the five principles that under gird Navigation 101 and shall develop a funding model to support it.*
    - *An assigned advisor*
    - *Student planning of curriculum*
    - *Student-led conference*
    - *Focus on data and evaluation*
    - *Development of a master schedule*
- *Rationale: Programs built on the five principles address remove barriers in the following ways.*
    - *They encourage students to achieve adequate preparation to achieve their life goals.*
    - *They encourage self-exploration and self-direction.*
    - *They are built on a model of cultural competence.*
    - *They engage families.*
    - *They serve all students equally.*
    - *They teach students and their families how to be educational consumers.*
    - *They emphasize financial planning to enable access.*
    - *They increase the likelihood that all students who wish to be will be college ready.*

Position Statement 2: Higher Education Orientation, Advising, and Academic Support Systems

- *The HECB, SBCTC, and COP shall conduct a study of first-year orientation, advising, and academic support programs in state colleges and universities to identify characteristics of these programs and to determine how effectively they support students through the first crucial year of higher education enrollment, with special emphasis on low-income and first generation students and students of color.*
- *Rationale: Considerable evidence suggests that college completion is predicted by success in the first crucial year of college. Retention rates at colleges and universities typically differ among students based on demographic*

characteristics. This study is a first step in achieving the larger goal of improving retention of diverse populations.

Graduation and College Entry Standards

Position Statement 1: Baccalaureate Minimum Admission Standards

- *The HECB shall adopt Baccalaureate Minimum Admission Standards that are correlated with success in college and shall ensure that these standards are easily understood, widely communicated, and equitably promoted to all students and their families in the K-12 system beginning early enough in the K-12 experience that students are empowered to make choices that provide options later in life.*
- *Rationale:*

Position Statement #2: BMAS in Competency Language

- *The HECB in consultation with college and university faculty shall begin a review of the Baccalaureate Minimum Admissions Standards for the purpose of converting them to competency language.*
- *Rationale:*

Position Statement #3:

- *The HECB shall work with OSPI to ensure that the core course database related to the Baccalaureate Minimum Admissions Standards is maintained.*
- *Rationale:*

Position Statement #4

- *OSPI shall continue its work with higher education institutions and agencies to achieve alignment between minimum college admissions standards, high school graduation requirements, and competencies tested by the WASL. The Transitions Math Project is exemplary of this approach.*
- *The K-12 system shall support all students who have not reached the age of 21 who are enrolled in any public post-secondary program that is designed to remedy deficits related to the minimum college admission standards.*
- *Rationale:*

<u>Equity</u>

Position Statement 1: Achieving equity in high school completion and college participation

- *The K-12 system and public higher education system shall identify and implement strategies that effectively promote high school completion and preparation for post-secondary experiences among low-income and first-generation students and students of color.*

Rationale: